

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION

Please read the instructions before completing this form. For additional forms or assistance in completing this form, contact your agency's Paperwork Clearance Officer. Send two copies of this form, the collection instrument to be reviewed, the Supporting Statement, and any additional documentation to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Docket Library, Room 10102, 725 17th Street NW Washington, DC 20503.

239185

USC 6-2003-14779-3

<p>1. Agency/Subagency originating request</p> <p><u>Dept. of Homeland Security/US Coast Guard</u></p>	<p>2. OMB control number</p> <p>a. <u>1 6 2 5 - 0 0 7 7</u> b. <input type="checkbox"/> None</p>
<p>3. Type of information collection (check one)</p> <p>a. <input type="checkbox"/> New collection</p> <p>b. <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of a currently approved collection</p> <p>c. <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of a currently approved collection</p> <p>d. <input type="checkbox"/> Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired</p> <p>e. <input type="checkbox"/> Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired</p> <p>f. <input type="checkbox"/> Existing collection in use without an OMB control number</p> <p><i>For b-f, note item A2 of Supporting Statement instructions</i></p>	<p>4. Type of review requested (check one)</p> <p>a. <input type="checkbox"/> Regular submission</p> <p>b. <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency - Approval requested by: <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u></p> <p>c. <input type="checkbox"/> Delegated</p> <p>5. Small entities. Will this information collection have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>6. Requested expiration date</p> <p>a. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Three years from approval date b. <input type="checkbox"/> Other Specify: <u> </u> / <u> </u></p>	
<p>7. Title</p> <p><u>Security of Passenger Vessels and Passenger Terminals</u></p> <p><u>[Formerly 2115-0622]</u></p>	
<p>8. Agency form number(s) (if applicable)</p> <p><u>n/a</u></p>	
<p>9. Keywords</p> <p><u>Passenger, Security, Terminal, Vessel</u></p>	
<p>10. Abstract</p> <p>The purpose of the security of passenger vessels and passenger terminals regulations is to deter, or mitigate the results of, terrorism and other unlawful acts against pax vessels and terminals. The regulations should reduce the likelihood of such acts and should reduce the damage to property and injury to persons, if such acts occur.</p>	
<p>11. Affected public (Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "X")</p> <p>a. <input type="checkbox"/> Individuals or households d. <input type="checkbox"/> Farms</p> <p>b. <input type="checkbox"/> Business or other for-profit e. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Federal Government</p> <p>c. <input type="checkbox"/> Not-for-profit institutions f. <input type="checkbox"/> State, Local or Tribal Gov't</p>	<p>12. Obligation to respond (Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "X")</p> <p>a. <input type="checkbox"/> Voluntary</p> <p>b. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Required to obtain or retain benefits</p> <p>c. <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory</p>
<p>13. Annual reporting and recordkeeping hour burden</p> <p>a. Number of respondents <u>248</u></p> <p>b. Total annual responses <u>124</u></p> <p> 1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically <u>10</u> %</p> <p>c. Total annual hours requested <u>3,549</u></p> <p>d. Current OMB inventory <u>1,811</u></p> <p>e. Difference <u>+ 1,738</u></p> <p>f. Explanation of difference</p> <p> 1. Program change <u> </u></p> <p> 2. Adjustment <u>+ 1,738</u></p>	<p>14. Annual reporting and recordkeeping cost burden (in thousands of dollars)</p> <p>a. Total annualized capital/startup costs <u> </u></p> <p>b. Total annual costs (O&M) <u> </u></p> <p>c. Total annualized cost requested <u> </u></p> <p>d. Current OMB inventory <u> </u></p> <p>e. Difference <u> </u></p> <p>f. Explanation of difference</p> <p> 1. Program change <u> </u></p> <p> 2. Adjustment <u> </u></p>
<p>15. Purpose of information collection (Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "X")</p> <p>a. <input type="checkbox"/> Application for benefits e. <input type="checkbox"/> Program planning or management</p> <p>b. <input type="checkbox"/> Program evaluation f. <input type="checkbox"/> Research</p> <p>c. <input type="checkbox"/> General purpose statistics</p> <p>d. <input type="checkbox"/> Audit g. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regulatory or compliance</p>	<p>16. Frequency of recordkeeping or reporting (check all that apply)</p> <p>a. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recordkeeping b. <input type="checkbox"/> Third party disclosure</p> <p>c. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reporting</p> <p> 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On occasion 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Weekly 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Monthly</p> <p> 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Quarterly 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Semi-annually 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Annually</p> <p> 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Biennially 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe) <u> </u></p>
<p>17. Statistical methods</p> <p>Does this information collection employ statistical methods?</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>18. Agency contact (person who can best answer questions regarding the content of this submission)</p> <p>Name: <u>Mr. David Du Pont</u></p> <p>Phone: <u>(202) 267-0971</u></p>

**Supporting Statement
for
Security of Passenger Vessels and Passenger Terminals**

A. Justification

1. Explain the circumstances that make collection of information necessary.

In 1985, a U.S. citizen was killed during the seizure of the vessel, Achille Lauro. Since then, the vulnerability of passenger vessels and associated passenger terminals to acts of terrorism has been a significant concern for the international community. To address this threat, the President signed into law the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (Pub. L. 99-399; 100 Stat. 889). Title IX of this law constitutes the International Maritime and Port Security Act (33 USC 1226). This act amended the Ports and Waterways Safety Act (33 USC 1221). The International Maritime and Port Security Act provided the Coast Guard authority to "carry out or require measures, including inspections, port and harbor patrols, the establishment of security and safety zones, and the development of contingency plans and procedures, to prevent or respond to acts of terrorism." This law also required a proposed plan of action for implementing of security measures at U.S. ports and passenger vessels operating from those ports.

Also in 1986, the International Maritime Organization (IMO) published MSC/Circ. 443 "Measures to Prevent Unlawful Acts Against Passengers and Crews On Board Ships." That publication was the basis for much of the U.S. legislation and rulemaking that followed. In April 1987, the Coast Guard published a notice in the *Federal Register* (52 FR 11587) that listed voluntary security measures based upon the IMO's publication. However, the Coast Guard observed varying degrees of implementation of these voluntary measures aboard passenger ships and at passenger terminals. This inconsistency, coupled with the rising specter of domestic terrorism, indicated that the establishment of minimum mandatory security requirements was necessary. Consequently, the Coast Guard published an interim rule on July 18, 1996 (61 FR 37648), and a final rule on October 6, 1998 (63 FR 53587).

[33 CFR 120 concerns the Security of Passenger Vessels. 33 CFR 128 concerns the Security of Passenger Terminals.]

This information collection supports the following strategic goals:

Coast Guard

- Safety
- Maritime Security
- Protection of Natural Resources
- Mobility
- National Defense

Marine Safety, Security and Environmental Protection Directorate (G-M)

- Safety: Eliminate deaths, injuries, and property damage associated with commercial maritime operations.
- Security: Eliminate marine transportation and coastal security vulnerability.
- Human and Natural Environment: Eliminate environmental damage associated with maritime transportation and operations on and around the nation's waterways.
- Economic Growth and Trade/Mobility: Reduce interruptions and impediments that restrict the economical movement of goods and people, while maximizing safe, effective, and efficient waterways for all users.

2. By whom, how, and for what purpose the information is to be used.

Operators or operator's representatives of both passenger vessels and passenger terminals affected by this rule must submit a Security Plan. Amendments and Reports of Unlawful Acts must be submitted when necessary.

Security Plans and Amendments:

Each operator of a passenger vessel subject to the rule must submit two copies of the Vessel Security Plan (required by 33 CFR 120.300) to the Directory, National Maritime Center (NMC), 4200 Wilson Blvd., Suite 510, Arlington, VA 22203, at least 60 days before embarking passengers on a voyage described in 33 CFR 120.100. If the Directory of NMC finds that the Vessel Security Plan meets the requirements of 33 CFR 120.300, the Director shall return a copy to the owner or operator marked "Examined by the Coast Guard." If the Director of the NMC finds the Plan does not meet the requirements of CFR 120.300, the Director shall return the plan with an explanation of why it does not meet the requirements. The operator of a passenger vessel may initiate Amendments to the Vessel Security Plan on its own as well as when directed by the Director of NMC.

Each operator of a passenger terminal subject to the rule must submit two copies of the Terminal Security Plan required by 33 CFR 128.300 to the Captain of the Port (COTP) at least 60 days before transferring passengers to or from a vessel subject to 33 CFR 120. If the COTP finds the Terminal Security Plan meets the requirements of 33 CFR 128.300, the COTP shall return a copy to the owner or operator marked "Examined by the Coast Guard." If the COTP finds that the Plan does not meet the requirements of 33 CFR 128.300, the COTP will return the Plan with an explanation of why it does not meet the requirements. The operator or a passenger terminal may initiate Amendments to the Terminal Security Plan on its own as well as when directed by the COTP.

The Coast Guard expects 140 passenger vessels (data obtained from NMC) will submit Vessel Security Plans and 108 passenger terminals will submit Terminal Security Plans (the number of terminals was obtained from the Federal Register Notice [67 FR 79795], Notice of Public Meetings for Maritime Security). The Coast Guard expects 5 new plans to be submitted each year.

Reports of Unlawful Acts:

The operator of a vessel or the vessel security officer shall report each breach of security, unlawful act, or threat of an unlawful act against the vessel or persons aboard it that occurs in a place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, both to the COTP and to the local office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Also, the operator of each U.S.-flag vessel shall report each such incident that occurs in a place outside the jurisdiction of the United States to the hotline of the National Response Center of the Department of Transportation at 1-800-424-8802, or, from within metropolitan Washington D.C., at 202-267-3675. Furthermore, either the operator of the vessel or vessel security officer shall file a written report of the incident, using the form "Report on an Unlawful Act" contained in IMO MSC Circular 443, which the operator of security officer shall forward as soon as possible to Commandant (G-MOR), U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, 2100 Second Street SW, Washington, DC 20593-001. Notification of an incident may be initially field by fax. Original copies should be sent by mail in conjunction with faxing the report to the Commandant (G-MOR); fax numbers are 202-267-4085/4065.

Either the operator of a terminal or the operator's representative shall report each unlawful act, breach of security, or threat of an unlawful act against:

- the terminal,
- a passenger vessel subject to 33 CFR 120 that is destined for or moored at that terminal, or
- persons at the terminal or on the vessel,

to the COTP, local office of the FBI, and local police agency having the jurisdiction over the terminal. Furthermore, the operator of the terminal or operator's representative shall file a written report of the incident using the form "Report on an Unlawful Act," contained in IMO MSC Circular 443, as soon as possible to the local COTP.

Actual Experience:

On July 18, 1996, the Coast Guard published an interim rule (61 FR 37648) requiring the development of Security Plans by passenger vessels and passenger terminals. The interim rule required all passenger vessels and passenger terminals covered by the rule to submit Plans by October 16, 1996. Implementation of the interim rule was highly successful. The passenger vessels and passenger terminals affected by the

rule developed plans to ensure passenger vessels and passenger terminals were prepared to handle terrorist threats or actions. Additionally, the Department of Transportation, Coast Guard, and industry worked cooperatively on several related projects to enhance security for the passenger vessels and passenger terminals. The success of the interim rule led to the publication of the final rule (63 FR 53587).

3. Consideration of the use of improved information technology.

Respondents can fax an initial "Report on an Unlawful Act" to the Coast Guard. We estimate that 100% of the reporting requirements can be done electronically. At this time, we estimate that approximately 10% of the responses are collected electronically.

4. Efforts to identify duplication. Why similar information cannot be used.

The Coast Guard monitors state and local regulatory activity in this field. To date, no equivalent state or local programs have been identified that require similar information, and no other Federal agencies have equivalent regulatory requirements.

5. Methods to minimize the burden to small businesses if involved.

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 USC 601 et seq.), the Coast Guard must consider whether this rule will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000.

The small entities affected by this rule are small businesses classified by the U.S. Standard Industrial Classification as "Water Transportation of Passengers, N.E.C." with SIC Code 4489. According to 13 CFR 121, small businesses in this industry group are defined as employing less than 500 people.

Of the 140 passenger vessels affected by this rulemaking, the average displacement of each vessel is 50,000 gross tons. The average passenger capacity is 1,200 passengers and the average crew size is about 500 persons. About 91% (or 127) of those passenger vessels are owned by companies with fleets of 2 or more vessels. Together, the gross tonnage, crew size, and passenger capacity suggest at least 91% (or 127) of those vessels are owned by companies that are not small entities.

The Coast Guard determined that two of the single-vessel companies being affected by this rule are small entities. (Another two single-vessel companies were found to employ more than 500 workers.) The Coast Guard was not able to determine if the other 9 single-vessel companies were small entities because of the lack of sufficient information. Consequently, the Coast Guard concludes that this rulemaking impacts at least 2 small entities.

The burdens of this rule are primarily the time and cost it takes to perform security planning and surveys. Security requirements for small vessels and terminals will be less complex, and therefore, less time-consuming and less costly to implement, than for large vessels and terminals. The reduced complexity will result in hours and costs to small entities that are less than the average hour burden and cost to larger entities.

6. Consequences to the Federal program if collection were not done or conducted less frequently.

A Vessel Security Plan or Terminal Security Plan is submitted only once. Amendments are submitted only when necessary to ensure continued compliance with regulatory standards. If the Plans or Amendments were reported and recorded less frequently, they would not serve their purpose of reducing the likelihood of terrorist incidents or other unlawful acts against passenger vessels and their associated damage to property and injury to persons. However, the Coast Guard learned that some plans were amended more than once on some occasions.

7. Explain any special circumstances that would cause the information collection to be conducted in a manner inconsistent with guidelines.

This information collection is consistent with the guidelines.

8. Consultation.

On March 25, 1994, the Coast Guard published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) entitled "Security for Passenger Vessels and Passenger Terminals" in 59 FR 14290. On July 18, 1996, the Coast Guard published an interim rule in 61 FR 37648. Finally, on October 6, 1998 the Coast Guard published the final rule in 63 FR 53588.

9. Explain any decision to provide payment or gift to respondents.

Neither payments nor gifts are given to respondents.

10. Describe any assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents.

The Coast Guard examines both Security Plans and Reports of Unlawful Acts. These Plans and Reports are law enforcement documents and as such are not releasable through the Freedom of Information Act. Aside from these facts, no particular assurance of confidentiality is provided to respondents. This information collection complies with the Privacy Act of 1974 and OMB Circular A-108.

11. Additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature.

No information of a sensitive nature is required in this information collection.

12. Estimates of reporting and record-keeping hour and cost burdens of the collection of information.

Security Plans:

Each passenger vessel and passenger terminal affected by this rule must submit one Security Plan. It is estimated that as of January 2003, 140 passenger vessels and 108 passenger terminals have submitted Security Plans. The Coast Guard estimates it takes 108 hours to draft, edit, and distribute each Security Plan. With 248 respondents, the Coast Guard estimates there are 248 Security Plans with a total hour burden of 26,784 hours ($248 \times 108 = 26,784$). Because this is a one-time event, this burden is amortized over the 25-year period of analysis. Therefore, the average annual burden is 1071 hours ($26,784/25 \text{ years} = 1,071$). We also expect about 5 new plans will be submitted each year. Thus, an additional 540 hours burden will be added a year ($5 \times 108 = 540$) or 13,500 hours over 25 years ($540 \times 25 = 13,500$ hours). Total hours over 25 years will be 40,284 ($26,784 + 13,500 = 40,284$). The total average annual hour burden over 25 years is 1,611 ($1,071 + 540 = 1,611$).

Most of the information required for creating a Security Plan is available in existing records or is otherwise available to a vessel operator or terminal operator. However, a security survey of a passenger vessel or passenger terminal should be conducted in order to draft a Security Plan. A security survey, on average, requires 40 hours of research by security personnel. Furthermore, it is estimated that it takes, on average, an additional 48 hours of management personnel (example, security officer) to review the security survey and use it to draft the Security Plan. An additional 20 hours of clerical time is expected to type and distribute the Security Plan. The total hour burden per respondent to develop, draft and submit a Security Plan is estimated to be 108 hours ($40 + 48 + 20$).

The average hourly wage of security personnel is estimated to be \$22/hour, which is comparable to the non-government wage of enlisted personnel, E-1 (*Hourly Standard Rates for Personnel*, Commandant Instruction 73101.1F). Because a security survey is expected to take an average of 40 hours of research by security personnel, the Coast Guard expects a security survey to have an average cost of \$880.

The average hourly wage of management personnel is estimated to be \$63/hour, which is the average of the hourly wages for non-government equivalents of commanders/captains and lieutenants/lieutenant commanders (Commandant Instruction 73101.1F). Because it is expected to take an average of 48 hours to draft a basic Security Plan, the basic draft is expected to cost an average of \$3,024.

The average hourly wage of clerical staff is estimated to be \$23/hour, which is comparable to the non-government wage of government workers GS-1 through GS-4 or E-1 through E-5 (Commandant Instruction 73101.1F). Because it is expected to take an average of 20 hours of clerical-staff time to type and distribute the Security Plan, the typed and submitted Plan is expected to cost an average of \$460.

The average total cost to draft, revise, type and distribute a Security Plan is estimated to be \$4,364 (\$880 + \$3,024 + \$460). With 248 Security Plans, the total cost of the Security Plan requirement is \$1,627,772 ($\$4,364 \times 248 = \$1,082,272$) + \$545,500 = (\$21,820 x 25), ($\$4,364 \times 5 = \$21,820$ for the 5 new plans a year). Because a Security Plan is a one-time event, plus the addition of 5 new plans a year, the total cost is amortized over the 25-year period of analysis. Consequently, the average annual cost is \$65,111 ($\$1,082,272/25 = \$43,291$) + \$21,820 = \$65,111. Total cost for all plans over 25 years is \$1,627,772.

Amendments:

Again, the Coast Guard expects 50% of the passenger vessels and passenger terminals will submit Amendments each year after submitting a Security Plan the first year. Thus, 124 respondents are expected to submit Amendments each year after the initial year. Each Amendment is expected to take 4 hours of security-personnel time, 4.8 hours of management-personnel time, and 2 hours of clerical-personnel time. Consequently, each Amendment is expected to require an average of 10.8 hours of labor time. With 124 Amendments, the total annual hour burden is 1339 hours. Over the 25-year period of analysis, the average total annual hour burden of Amendments is 1,285 hours ($[1,339 \times 24]/25$). Five new plans will be submitted each year for a total of 1500 over 24 years; the first five this year will not be amended until next year and the 5 new ones next year will not be amended until the third year and so on. See attached spreadsheet. The total annual hour burden for Amendments from new plans is 648 hours ($[1500 \times 10.8]/25$). The total annual hour burden for the expected 124 Amendments each year plus the new Amendments is $1,285 + 648 = 1,933$ hours.

Each Amendment is expected to cost \$88 in security-personnel labor ($4 \times \$22$), \$302 in management-personnel labor ($4.8 \times \$63$), and \$46 in clerical-personnel labor ($2 \times \$23$). The Coast Guard expects an Amendment will cost an average of \$436 (\$88 + \$302 + \$46). With an expected 124 Amendments per year, the total annual cost of Amendments is estimated to be \$54,064. For Amendments from newly submitted plans each year, the total annual cost is \$26,160 ($[\$436 \times 1,500]/25$). Over the 25-year period of analysis, the average total annual cost of Amendments is \$51,901 ($[\$54,064 \times 24]/25$) + \$26,160 = \$78,061. Total cost over 25 years for expected 124 Amendments and 5 new ones a year is \$1,297,525 ($\$51,901 \times 25$) + \$654,000 ($\$26,160 \times 25 = \$654,000$) = \$1,951,525.

Reports of Unlawful Acts:

Using available information, the Coast Guard estimates that 20 reportable unlawful acts will occur each year. One report must be filed for each act. Preparation of a report requires an average of 0.25 hours (or 15 minutes) for a manager to complete. Consequently, the Coast Guard expects a total annual hour burden of 5 hours (20×0.25). Over the 25-year period of analysis, the total hour burden of Reports of Unlawful Acts is 125 hours (5×25). At an hourly wage rate of \$63, the total annual cost of these reports is \$315 ($\63×5). Over the 25-year period of analysis, the total cost of these reports is \$7,875 ($\315×25).

The average total annual hour burden of this rule is 3,549 hours. The average total annual cost is \$143,487. See Table 1 below.

Table 1: Hour Burden and Cost Burden

Year	Security Plans Hours/Cost	Hours for New Plans/Cost	Amendments Hours/Cost	Hours for new Amendments/ Cost	Reports of Unlawful Acts Hours/Cost	Total Hours/ Total Cost
1	1071 hrs/\$43,291	540 hrs/\$21,820	1285 hrs/\$51,901	648 hrs/\$26,160	5 hrs/\$315	3,549 hrs/\$143,487
2	1071 hrs/\$43,291	540 hrs/\$21,820	1285 hrs/\$51,901	648 hrs/\$26,160	5 hrs/\$315	3,549 hrs/\$143,487
3	1071 hrs/\$43,291	540 hrs/\$21,820	1285 hrs/\$51,901	648 hrs/\$26,160	5 hrs/\$315	3,549 hrs/\$143,487
4	1071 hrs/\$43,291	540 hrs/\$21,820	1285 hrs/\$51,901	648 hrs/\$26,160	5 hrs/\$315	3,549 hrs/\$143,487
5	1071 hrs/\$43,291	540 hrs/\$21,820	1285 hrs/\$51,901	648 hrs/\$26,160	5 hrs/\$315	3,549 hrs/\$143,487
6	1071 hrs/\$43,291	540 hrs/\$21,820	1285 hrs/\$51,901	648 hrs/\$26,160	5 hrs/\$315	3,549 hrs/\$143,487
7	1071 hrs/\$43,291	540 hrs/\$21,820	1285 hrs/\$51,901	648 hrs/\$26,160	5 hrs/\$315	3,549 hrs/\$143,487
8	1071 hrs/\$43,291	540 hrs/\$21,820	1285 hrs/\$51,901	648 hrs/\$26,160	5 hrs/\$315	3,549 hrs/\$143,487
9	1071 hrs/\$43,291	540 hrs/\$21,820	1285 hrs/\$51,901	648 hrs/\$26,160	5 hrs/\$315	3,549 hrs/\$143,487
10	1071 hrs/\$43,291	540 hrs/\$21,820	1285 hrs/\$51,901	648 hrs/\$26,160	5 hrs/\$315	3,549 hrs/\$143,487
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
23	1071 hrs/\$43,291	540 hrs/\$21,820	1285 hrs/\$51,901	648 hrs/\$26,160	5 hrs/\$315	3,549 hrs/\$143,487
24	1071 hrs/\$43,291	540 hrs/\$21,820	1285 hrs/\$51,901	648 hrs/\$26,160	5 hrs/\$315	3,549 hrs/\$143,487
25	1071 hrs/\$43,291	540 hrs/\$21,820	1285 hrs/\$51,901	648 hrs/\$26,160	5 hrs/\$315	3,549 hrs/\$143,487
Total	26,784 hours \$1,082,272	13,500 hours \$545,500	32,125 hours \$1,297,525	16,200 hours \$654,000	125 hours \$7,875	88,725 hours \$3,587,175

13. Estimates of annualized capital and start-up costs.

There are no annualized capital and start-up costs to respondents.

14. Estimates of annualized Federal Government costs.

Coast Guard analysis and research indicates there are 248 entities (140 passenger vessels and 108 passenger terminals) impacted by this rule. [Approximately, 2 of the passenger vessels are U.S. flag vessels and all of the passenger terminals are located in the U.S. or its territories.]

Reviews of Security Plans and Amendments:

It is expected to take personnel at NMC an average of 3.76 hours to review each Security Plan. It will take a GS-13 2.76 hours to review each Security Plan. Each Security Plan will then be reviewed by a junior officer (1 hour). The average hourly wage of a GS-13 is \$50 and the average hourly wage of a Lieutenant is \$43 (Commandant Instruction 73101.1F). Consequently, the average cost to review a Security Plan is estimated to be \$181 (\$138 for GS-13 + \$43 for a junior-officer). The total cost to review 248 Security Plans is \$44,888. Over a 25-year period of analysis, the average annual cost to the Coast Guard to review Security Plans is \$1,796.

After the first year, 50% (or 124) of the respondents would submit Amendments. It is expected to take personnel an average of 2 hours to review each Amendment. Each Amendment will be given an initial review by personnel equivalent to GS-13 at NMC (1.6 hours), then given a final review by a junior officer (0.4 hours). Consequently, the average cost to review an Amendment is estimated to be approximately \$97.2 (\$17.2 for junior-officer time + \$80 for GS-13). The total cost to the Coast Guard to review 124 Amendments is \$12,053 (124 x \$97.2). When amortized over the 25-year period of analysis, the average annual cost to the Coast Guard to review Amendments is \$11,571 ($[\$12,053 \times 24]/25$). For new Amendments at 5 per year, total annual cost per year is \$5,832 ($[\$97.2 \times 1,500]/25$). The total cost over 25 years is \$145,800. The annual total cost for all Amendments each year is \$11,571 + \$5,832 = \$17,403. Over 25 years the total cost for all Amendments is $(\$11,571 \times 25) + (\$5,832 \times 25) = \$289,275 + \$145,800 = \$435,075$.

Reviews of Reports of Unlawful Acts and Enforcement of Security Planning:

During annual visits to passenger vessels, Coast Guard officers would have to take the following actions:

- Review Reports of Unlawful Acts (0.08 hours), and
- Verify presence of Coast Guard-reviewed Security Plan (0.08 hours).

These actions would add approximately 0.16 hours to the passenger vessel inspection. Assuming the inspection party consists of one Lieutenant and one Ensign or Lieutenant Junior Grade, labor cost per hour is \$43 for the Lieutenant and an average of \$31 for the Ensign and Lieutenant JG. The total cost to the Coast Guard is \$5.92 per passenger vessel per year ($[(\$43 + \$31)/2 \times 0.16]$). With a total of 140 passenger vessels, the total annual cost to the Coast Guard to review reports and verify compliance on board passenger vessels is \$829 ($140 \times \5.92).

During visits to passenger terminals, Coast Guard junior officers would have to take account for the following time (averages):

- Travel time (0.33 hours),
- Review of Reports of Unlawful Acts (0.08 hours),
- Verify presence of Coast Guard-reviewed Security Plan (0.08 hours), and
- Observe security practices at boarding area, and other areas of concern based on plans (0.25 hours).

These actions would take approximately 0.74 hours to complete. Assuming the inspection party consists of two junior officers, the cost to the Coast Guard (\$31 is the average of a Lieutenant JG and an Ensign) to visit each passenger terminal would be \$23 per year ($\31×0.74). With 108 passenger terminals, the total annual cost to the Coast Guard to review reports and verify compliance at passenger terminals is \$2,484 ($108 \times \23).

The average total annual cost to the Coast Guard over the 25-year period of analysis is estimated to be \$22,512 ($\$1,796 + \$17,403 + \$829 + \$2,484$).

15. Explain the reasons for the change in burden.

With updated information, there were increases in the following variables: 1) the number of respondents increased from 190 to 248), average hourly wages increased as well (current figures based on Commandant Instruction 73101.1F). Also, we accounted for the approximate number of new plans (5) being filed each year and the corresponding number of Amendments associated with those plans. These increases resulted in increases to both the hourly burdens and costs to respondents and government.

16. For collections of information whose results are planned to be published for statistical use, outline plans for tabulation, statistical analysis and publication.

There are no plans to publish information for statistical use.

17. Approval to not display expiration date.

This is not applicable.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement.

There are no exceptions.

B. Collection of Information Employing Statistical Methods

This section does not apply because the collection does not employ statistical methods.